

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 4-13, 16-26, 29, and 30 are pending.

Claims 29 and 30 are the independent claims.

Claims 4, 5, 6, 29 and 30 have been amended.

Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 26-28, and 31-33 have been cancelled, without prejudice to or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 4-13, 16-25, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2002/0054090 (*Silva*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Silva* in view of US 7,039,037 (*Wang*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9, 11, 21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Silva* in view of US 2002/0062467 (*Hunzinger*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Is Traversed

There are several fundamental differences between *Sylva* and the presently claimed methods and systems. The differences are in the functionality and the implementation of the method and system. While *Silva* provides a personal service for a

human user to define a Web view at one terminal and access said web view later on using a second terminal, the claimed system activates contextual based services of a proxy server by comparing the sequence of user navigational track within a content server to pre-defined hyperlinks titles sequences which were defined by operator of a proxy server. The proxy server services are defined according to their contextual location in association to sequence of hyperlinks.

Claim 29 and 30 have been amended to emphasize one aspect of the uniqueness of the instant invention. The claimed system enables to configure proxy server services and actions by defining sequences of hyperlinks titles of a content server. When the user navigates through the content server, their navigation track of sequence of hyperlinks sequences is recorded for a short time period. The recorded sequence of hyperlinks titles is compared to the sequences defined by the proxy server operator for determining the service and the actions to be executed by the proxy server according to the contextual location of the user within the proxy server.

Silva discusses a system that enables a user to create a personalized Web view of content in a Web page for later access by users through diverse terminals having different types of processing and display capabilities. The Web view provides a shortcut to specific content and services, which a user is interested in retrieving through limited bandwidth, high latency "thin" devices such as PDAs and WAP phones. (Silva, Abstract). Silva further elaborates on the process of creating the personalized web view: "To create a Web view, a user first specifies the Web page to be clipped. If the page

requires multiple steps in order to be retrieved and does not have a well-defined URL, the user can use the recorder component of the Web view applet to create the script to access the page. Using a VCR-style interface to transparently record browsing actions, a users can simply navigate his way to the final page while his actions (links traversed, forms filled along with the user inputs, and any other interactions with active content) are transparently recorded and saved in a smart bookmark" (Silva, paragraph 29).

Silva discloses a system that enables a user to access specific web views through mobile which were specified by the user. The web view determines browsing actions to be executed according to the definitions of the user himself:" "The Web view encapsulates the actions required to retrieve a particular page, along with the specification of which components should be extracted from the retrieved page." (Silva 23).

Hence, Silva is silent regarding determining proxy services and actions which relate to navigation track within a content server. Silva is also silent regarding defining sequence of hyperlinks titles by the proxy server operator, for determining the proxy server services and actions. Silva does not disclose the comparison between the recorded navigation by the user and the defined sequence of hyperlinks. In Silva, during the surfing period the user only access a specific web view, for applying browsing actions to according recorded script, hence no comparison operation can be executed.

Claim 4 was amended to distinguish the difference between restriction of control access defined by the proxy sever to a content server as disclosed by the applicant and user definition of retrieving content by the defined user himself as disclosed by Silva. The web views defined in Silva can not be regarded as access restrictions, but only as instructions for operating browsing activities.

Claim 5 was amended to distinct the caching services of a proxy server which are determined according to identification of the contextual location of user within the location service. Silva uses the term cache regarding the web view and not the caching of the content.

Claim 6 was amended to distinct the billing service provided by the proxy server which apply billing rules based on the contextual location of the user within the content server. The billing action rules are not functional but refer to the structural main purpose of the instant invention to provide services by the proxy server.

Independent claim 30 corresponds recites features similar to those of claim 29, in system form.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 29 and 30, as amended, define over the cited art.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Are Traversed

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are traversed because neither *Wang* nor *Hunzinger*, either alone or in combination with *Silva*, teach or suggest the aforementioned

features newly recited in amended claims 29 and 30. Therefore, the rejected claims, being dependent on Claims 29 and 30, are also novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art.

Specifically, *Wang* teaches a method to provide control and policy enforcement of WAP services (*Wang*, Abstract) and is silent as to aforementioned feature (absent in *Silva* too) of providing services based on comparison of user navigational track in a content server to predefined sequence of hyperlinks titles. *Hunzinger* teaches a content usage-base system (Abstract) that is also silent providing services based on comparison of user navigational track in a content server to predefined sequence of hyperlinks titles.

Regarding claim 4, *Wang* disclose a WAP gateway having a WAP controller for handling requests of mobile devices including " prepaid operations, security changes". *Wang* is silent regarding proxy services including billing actions based on pre-defined billing rules which are defined by the proxy operator. In *Wang* the proxy server only intermediate between mobile service requests and designated server which provide said services.

"WAP traffic can be classified into two categories, namely pull and push. The pull traffic is initiated by a WAP device requesting a service (e.g., prepaid operations, security changes, etc.) or information from a server, whereas the push traffic is generated by a server delivering information to the WAP device without explicit request. Push notifications identify WAP devices by their MSISDN and generally bypass the WAP controller (234) as shown at a bottom

of the FIG. 3. WAP Controller (234) generally addresses the pull traffic."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 29 and 30 patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite.

Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there any fees in addition to those being paid herewith for this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account 504438.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael Kondoudis/
Michael Kondoudis
Reg. No. 42, 758

**The Law Office
of Michael E. Kondoudis**
888 16th Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
202-349-9850